

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

United States District Court
Northern District of California

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

STEVEN HELDT,
Plaintiff,

v.
TATA CONSULTANCY SERVICES, LTD.,
Defendant.

Case No. 15-cv-01696-YGR

**ORDER DENYING DEFENDANT’S MOTION
TO TRANSFER VENUE TO THE CENTRAL
DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**


Re: Dkt. No. 22

Now pending before the Court is defendant Tata Consultancy Services, Ltd.’s motion to transfer venue to the Central District of California. (Dkt. No. 22.) Transfer under 28 U.S.C. Sec. 1404(a) to a venue where the case could have been brought is up to the discretion of the Court after an “individualized, case-by-case consideration of convenience and fairness.” *Stewart Org. v. Ricoh Corp.*, 487 U.S. 22, 29 (1988). The Ninth Circuit has recognized at least ten factors a district court may consider in its analysis under Section 1404(a). *Jones v. GNC Franchising, Inc. et al.*, 211 F.3d 495 (9th Cir. 2000). The Court has carefully reviewed the papers submitted and considered issues of convenience and fairness, and finds that transfer to the Central District of California is not appropriate. Assuming without deciding that the case could have been brought in the Central District, defendant has failed to show that the Central District is more convenient or that transfer would serve the interests of justice. Accordingly, defendant’s motion is **DENIED** and the hearing scheduled for August 11, 2015, is hereby **VACATED**.

This order terminates Docket No. 22.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: July 16, 2015


YVONNE GONZALEZ ROGERS
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT JUDGE